

DD/ST#

8/6/67

OEL-173/67

1 MAR 1967

*adm 10.7*

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Officer, DD/S&T  
Special Assistant, DD/S&T

SUBJECT: Project Officers Handbook

REFERENCE: A/DD/S&T Instructions at the 23 February  
Directorate Staff Meeting

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide both general and specific comments concerning the Project Officers Handbook. The general comments are contained in Paragraph 2 and the specific comments in Paragraph 3. Paragraphs 2 and 3 also contain recommendations.

2. Comments from our Division Chiefs, Project Officers and Staff personnel concerning the contents, style, format and usefulness of the Handbook as an aid in the initiation, management and direction of R&D projects have been very favorable. Many of the new EOD engineers as well as personnel who have been with the Agency for a number of years have indicated that the Handbook represents the most complete and concise documentation of its kind available within the Agency. As a general recommendation, we suggest there is a need for the Directorate to issue implementing instructions on those portions of the Handbook which the Offices are expected to follow in the directive sense. The standing DD/S&T instructions have been overtaken by the Handbook and other events. This action would clarify the relationship of the Handbook vis-a-vis the DD/S&T Instruction series.

3. Specific comments follow with all references to the appropriate sections of the Handbook.

DD/S&T  
FILE COPY

OEL-173/67

Page 2

25X1A

a. Foreward, Page iv - Suggest that the name of [ ] be deleted since he is now assigned as the Chief of Staff, Office of ELINT. His present position does not permit adequate time to be devoted to such an important project and further the location of his position out of the 'main stream' of the Directorate Staff mitigates against his performance of this function. Recommend that the name of [ ] Special Assistant to the A/DD/S&T, or another DD/S&T Staff member replace that of [ ]

25X1A

25X1A

b. Part I, Page I-8/9 - This Office follows a practice of having the Office of Logistics solicit proposals when the cost is expected to exceed \$50,000. Coordination is affected with the Chief, Procurement Management Staff, DD/S&T, who in turn makes appropriate arrangements with the Procurement Division, Office of Logistics. Recommend that this practice continue as specified in the Handbook, but with a degree of flexibility added which permits the Offices to solicit proposals regardless of cost when the timing of particular operational situations and requirements so dictate. In most cases, adequate time exists for a forecast of our needs, but there are instances where flexibility might offset a delay, and the concomitant loss of collection against a target of opportunity. Any such failure would reflect directly upon Directorate technical and managerial responsiveness.

c. Part I, Page I-10 - We believe that the section dealing with MFP/Q approval by DD/S&T on projects where the cost is expected to exceed \$50,000 is unsatisfactory and would work to the serious detriment of the A/DD/S&T, his Staff and the Offices. Recommend this section be revised to include a continued provision for the

OEL-173/67

Page 3

Directorate approval, but through the judicious application of one of the following alternatives. (OEL recommends Alternative 1.)

(1) Offices, during the course of the Quarterly Review to the A/DD/S&T, would identify and recommend those projects which they feel should be brought to the attention of the A/DD/S&T prior to proposal solicitation. Dollar value would be one consideration, since costs of [ ] must receive DCI approval, but it is conceivable that a relatively low cost item might be recommended because of potentially serious operational and policy considerations.

25X1A

(2) The arbitrary dollar value be set at an amount over [ ] to coincide with Agency directives concerning levels of approval authority (i.e., DCI on amounts in excess of [ ])

25X1A

25X1A

(3) The Offices provide a quarterly forecast memorandum to the A/DD/S&T recommending projects that should be considered for A/DD/S&T review prior to proposal solicitation. This might be done separately or in conjunction with alternative 1 (Paragraph 3c(1) above).

d. Part I, Page I-10 - The DD/S&T should establish a standard procedure for review of proposed RFP/Q actions under one of the alternatives described above. Recommend a system to provide maximum flexibility which permits the Offices to submit a memorandum, conduct a briefing(s), discuss the matter directly with the Office Directors and the A/DD/S&T or by any other method/means that insures coordination, understanding and approval by those having direct responsibility and/or related interest.

OEL-173/67

Page 4

25X1A As presently described in the Handbook, a memorandum may be neither desirable or needed because of project sensitivity, the need for rapid action and a variety of other equally valid reasons. A recent example is [redacted] which was presented to the A/DD/S&T, members of his Staff and selected Office Directors and their Staffs to obtain approval for proposal solicitation. The project is sensitive, and there is an urgent requirement to get on with the work. We do not believe that a memorandum, as described in the Handbook, would have been suitable.

e. Part II, Page II-5 - Recommend a modification of that section which describes the desirability of presenting briefings to gatherings of contractors. There is an obvious advantage to this procedure, but the Handbook could be modified to note that is one way to accomplish the action, as opposed to the stress upon this method as a general practice.

25X1A f. Part II, Page II-35 - Recommend that this section be modified to eliminate the requirement for the A/DD/S&T to sign letters acknowledging receipt of proposals exceeding [redacted]. These can be done by the Offices with a copy to the DD/S&T Procurement Management Staff and the Director of Logistics (Procurement Division). This change would preclude the A/DD/S&T and senior members of his Staff having to perform additional administrative tasks which appear to be Office responsibilities.

g. Part III, Page III-1 - This comment also generally applies to this entire section of the Handbook. As noted in Paragraph 2 above, DD/S&T should update its standing Instructions which are pertinent to the Contract Package. In that connection, the

OEL-173/67

Page 5

revised or new Instructions should be flexible so that each memorandum to the approval authority need not exactly conform to some prescribed and precise format. The format should be considered as a guide only, with the Directorate reviewing authorities taking into account Office differences in style and approaches to problem presentation and solution. In our opinion, the requirement to adhere to rigidly defined formats and contents for such memoranda will inevitably result in the A/DD/S&T receiving less informative and useful information.

h. Part V - Specific comments related to the accuracy of information present in the ADP section has been excluded, as the DD/S&T Comptroller is aware of the differences between the Handbook contents and the "real-life" situation. In general, we urge complete re-examination of the present Contract Information System (CIS) (or CONARS), for as now constituted, it is of extremely marginal value. A recommended approach would be to define Directorate requirements and then to design a management information system to meet those requirements. We recognize the relationship of this recommendation to that contained in the Livingstone Report, to that work currently being done by the DD/S ADP Management Staff and to other past/present DD/S&T Staff work. Early action on this recommendation may temporarily degrade contract information retrieval for certain special requirements, but in the long run would represent a significant improvement in the Directorate application of personnel and equipment resources.

25X1A

GEORGE C. MILLER  
Director of ELINT  
DD/S&T